

REMARKS

After entry of this amendment, claims 1-33 are pending. In the present Office Action, the previous restriction requirement was withdrawn. The present Office Action objected to the drawings. The present Office Action rejected claims 1-15 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and objections and requests reconsideration.

Section 112 Rejection

The Office Action rejected claims 1-27 under section 112, second paragraph, asserting that the antecedent basis for "a first computer system" was unclear in claims 1 and 16 since "a computer system" was already mentioned. Similarly, claim 27 was rejected for referring to "the computer system" since it could refer to the first computer system or the second computer system. Applicant has amended the claims to change references to "a (the) computer system" to "a (the) client computer system" for further clarification. Additionally, to further clarify that the first computer system of claims 1 and 16 may or may not be the client computer system, additional dependent claims 28-31 have been added. To further clarify that the second computer system of claim 27 may or may not be the client computer system, additional dependent claims 32-33 have been added.

Section 101 Rejection

The Office Action rejected claims 1-15, alleging that the computer accessible medium includes data signals or carrier wave. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The specification states: "a computer accessible medium may include ... media accessible via transmission media or signals such as electrical, electromagnetic, or digital signals, conveyed via a communication medium such as a network and/or a wireless link." Thus, the specification does not define the computer accessible medium as including signals, but rather media that are accessible via signals. Nevertheless, Applicant has amended claims 1-15 to recite a computer accessible storage media and respectfully submit that the amendment overcomes the rejection.

The Office Action also rejected claim 27, asserting the a computer system can be only software. Applicant respectfully disagrees, but has nonetheless amended claim 27 and recite computer accessible storage media, and respectfully submit that the amendment addresses the rejection.

Drawing Objection

The drawings were objected to, and the present Office Action required new drawings that used the label "FIG" instead of "Fig". Applicant has submitted replacement sheets herewith as requested, and respectfully submit that the replacement sheets address the objection.

Information Disclosure Statement (IDS)

Applicant filed an additional IDS subsequent to the mailing of the present Office Action. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the IDS and the references cited, and a return of the PTO-1449 form included therewith, initialed and signed by the Examiner to evidence such consideration.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5760-20600/LJM.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lawrence J. Merkel/

Lawrence J. Merkel, Reg.#41,191
AGENT FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: July 6, 2007